| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary   | Application No.                                     | Applicant(s)  |
|--|---|---|
|  | 09/806,913  | HIRABAYASHI ET AL.  |
|  | Examiner  | Art Unit  |
|  | Brian L. Mutschler                                  | 1753  |
| All Participants:  | Status of Application <u>rejection</u>              | n: <u>Amendment after non-final</u>                                   |
| (1) <u>Brian L. Mutschler</u> .  | (3)   |   |
| (2) <u>Shrinath Malur</u> .  | (4)   |   |
| Date of Interview: 17 May 2004   | Time:   |   |
| Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: .  | ant's representative)                               |   |
| Part I.  |   |   |
| Rejection(s) discussed: n/a  |   |   |
| Claims discussed: all pending  |   |   |
| Prior art documents discussed: n/a   |   |   |
| Part II.   |   |   |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE<br>See Continuation Sheet   | RAL NATURE OF WHAT                                  | WAS DISCUSSED:  |
| Part III.  |   |   |
| <ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summandal.</li> </ul> | e examiner will provide a record of the substance o | written summary of the substance f the interview, since the interview |
|  |   |   |
| Brian L Muschler   |   |   |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applican   | l/Applicant's Representativ                         | ve Signature – if appropriate)  |

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Malur was contacted to discuss a proposed amendment to the claims to place them in condition for allowance. In the independent claims, the newly added limitation "said wafer-shaped part moves relatively to said body to form an electroosmotic flow in one of said passages" should be changed to a positive structural limitation. The phrase "means for moving the wafer-shaped part relative to said body to form an electroosmotic flow sequentially in said passages" was suggested to incorporate the means for moving the wafer-shaped part described on page 14 at lines 7-9 of the specification and the sequential formation of electroosmotic flow originally presented in claim 7. The changes to the independent claims and the cancellation of claim 14 was approved by the Applicant and will be made by an Examiner's amendment.